REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending, while claims 19-27 are under consideration. Claims 19-22 are amended herein. Support for the amendments to claims 19-22 may be found in the specification at page 35, lines 12-25, continuing at page 36, lines 1-5. New claims 26 and 27 are added herein. Support for new claims 26 and 27 may be found at page 33, line 15-18 of the specification. The new claims read on the elected embodiments. Further reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The Applicants submit the following summary of the telephone interview that took place September 6, 2007 between the undersigned representative of the Applicants and the Examiner.

Office Conference:

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the many courtesies extended to the undersigned representative of the Applicants during the telephone interview that took place September 6, 2007.

Among the issues discussed during that interview were the patentability of the claims over the cited references, and the above effected amendments to the claims. Wellig, in particular, uses the local unique identifier as a sort of a terminal ID. Thus, Wellig would never need a separate session identifier *in addition to* the local unique identifiers. Rather, in Wellig, the communication session is identified completely by identifying the local unique identifiers of the participating mobile terminals, since, as may be seen in Fig. 7 of Wellig, only one communication session between MT1, using LUI-1, and MT2, using LUI-2, will ever occur at any given time. In the claimed invention, in contrast, an identifier is used for the communication session itself *in addition to* identifiers of the participating terminals, so that the gateway can map the communication between T1 and T2 properly.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wellig, US Patent No. 6,580,704 (hereinafter referred to as "Wellig"). The rejection is traversed, to the extent it might apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

The final clause of claim 19 recites:

> Communicating with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmission and reception of data containing the first session identification information S1, second session identification information S2, the first terminal identifier, and the second terminal identifier.

Wellig neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "communicating with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmission and reception of data containing the first session identification information S1, second session identification information S2, the first terminal identifier, and the second terminal identifier," as recited in claim 19.

In Wellig, rather, the access point (AP) sends address identifiers of the first and second *mobile terminals* to the second and first mobile terminals, respectively. Thus, in Wellig, an address identifier of the first mobile terminal is sent to the second mobile terminal, and an address identifier of the second mobile terminal is sent to the first mobile terminal, by the AP. Then, the first and second mobile terminals exchange *mobile terminal* identifier messages, i.e. "hello" messages, with each other. In particular, as described at column 4, line 67, continuing at column 5, lines 1-14:

> Such a DM scheme calls for (a) establishing that an initiating, first mobile terminal and a remote, second mobile terminal are associated to a same AP; (b) establishing that the remote, second mobile terminal supports a DM operation feature as does the initiating, first mobile terminal; (c) sending, by the AP, address identifiers of the first and second mobile terminals to the second and first mobile terminals, respectively, including granting of a frequency-power resource slot to each of the two mobile terminals to initiate received signal strength (RSS) measurements between the two mobile terminals; and (d) sending, to the AP, RSS measurements performed by the first and second mobile terminals of mobile terminal identifier messages (which are "hello" messages) sent to them by the second and first mobile terminals, respectively.

Since, in Wellig, the AP sends address identifiers of the first and second mobile terminals to the second and first mobile terminals, respectively, Wellig is not "communicating with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmission and reception of data containing the first session identification information S1, second session identification information S2, the first terminal identifier, and the second terminal identifier," as recited in claim 19.

Furthermore, in Wellig, all an MT that wants to communicate with another MT associated to the same AP needs to obtain is the *MAC-Id* address of the other, remote MT. In particular, as described at column 7, lines 6-16:

> Accordingly, for any MT which wants to communicate with another MT associated to the same AP, it is necessary for the initiating MT to obtain the MAC-Id address of the other, remote MT.

Since, in Wellig, all an MT that wants to communicate with another MT associated to the same AP needs to obtain is the MAC-Id address of the other, remote MT, Wellig is not "communicating with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmission and reception of data containing the first session identification information S1, second session identification information S2, the first terminal identifier, and the second terminal identifier," as recited in claim 19.

Furthermore, in Wellig, the AP will issue to the MTs the LUIs pertaining to *only* those MTs. In particular, as described at column 8, lines 51-55:

> The AP will issue to the MTs the LUIs pertaining to only those MTs and also grant slots (e.g., channel resource slots of a frame) for both MTs in order to allow them to initiate RSS measurements between them (step 33).

Since, in Wellig, the AP will issue to the MTs the LUIs pertaining to only those MTs, Wellig is not "communicating with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmission and reception of data containing the first session identification information S1, second session identification information S2, the first terminal identifier, and the second terminal identifier," as recited in claim 19.

Finally, in Wellig, the AP sends a "wake-up" message with a *MAC-Id1*, and MT2 sends a positive acknowledgement to the AP upon receiving the message. In particular, as described at column 11, lines 4-17:

> If remote MT2 is DM capable (i.e., DM implemented), AP sends a "wake-up" message: wake-up (cause=DM request by IP@MT1 with MAC-Id1,grant slot(s)) (steps 61.2, 61.3 in FIG. 6 and 2 in FIG. 7); (3) MT2 sends a positive acknowledgement to AP upon receiving the message (step 61.4 in FIG. 6 and 3 in FIG. 7); (4) AP grants a slot for RSS measurement to MT1: ack (MAC-Id2 of remote MT2, grant (slot))(step 61.5 in FIG. 6 and 4 in FIG. 7); (5) MT1 sends a "hello" message to remote MT2 during the granted slot.

Since, in Wellig, the AP sends a "wake-up" message with a MAC-Id1, Wellig is not "communicating with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmission and reception of data containing the first session identification information S1, second session identification information S2, the first terminal identifier, and the second terminal identifier," as recited in claim 19. Claim 19 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 20, 21, and 22:

The final clauses of claims 20, 21, and 22 recite substantially:

> Communicating with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmission and reception of data containing the first session identification information S1, second session identification information S2, the first terminal identifier, and the second terminal identifier.

Wellig neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "communicating with the second communications terminal T2 by carrying out transmission and reception of data containing the first session identification information S1, second session identification information S2, the first terminal identifier, and the second terminal identifier," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 19. Claims 20, 21, and 22 are thus also submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 19. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20, 21, and 22 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 23:

The second clause of claim 23 recites:

> Accepting by way of the secure host, from outside the secure host, a call request from an external terminal device to a connectable internal terminal device, or accepting by way of the secure host, from inside the secure host, a call request from an internal terminal device to a connectable external terminal device.

Wellig neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "accepting by way of the secure host, from outside the secure host, a call request from an external terminal device to a connectable internal terminal device, or accepting by way of the secure host, from inside the secure host, a call request from an internal terminal device to a connectable external terminal device," as recited in claim 23. In Wellig, rather, both of the MTs are external to the AP, there is no internal terminal device.

The third clause of claim 23 recites:

> When a call between the external terminal device and the internal terminal device is established.

Wellig neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "when a call between the external terminal device and the internal terminal device is established," as recited in claim 23, either. In Wellig, rather, both of the MTs are external to the AP, there is no internal terminal device, as discussed above.

The fourth clause of claim 23 recites:

> When the secure host has received, from the external terminal device or the internal terminal device, voice data containing the session identification information.

Wellig neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "when the secure host has received, from the external terminal device or the internal terminal device, voice data containing the session identification information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 19. In Wellig, rather, the MTs are being identified, not the communications. Claim 23 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is earnestly solicited.

New claims 26 and 27:

Claims 26 and 27 depend from claim 19 an add further distinguishing elements. Claim 26, for example, recites:

> Wherein the session identification information is generated based on the terminal identifier of the communications terminal.

While claim 27 recites:

> Wherein the session identification information is generated by a random number generator.

Claims 26 and 27 are thus believed to be allowable as well.

Allowable subject matter:

Since no specific grounds of rejection were cited against claims 24 and 25, claims 24 and 25 are presumed to contain allowable subject matter.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 19-27 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 19-27 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10 5007

By: _____

Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501